CORE 15 Schedule

HIGH - TTC

EARLY COMPLETION

Evaluation Criteria – Completing the Project quickly and efficiently

Edit	Facts	Edit	Significant Strengths	Minor Strengths	Minor Weaknesses	Significant Weaknesses
	Project Completion 30-Oct-2013 415 days ahead of schedule		• Efficiently developed key usable portions of the Project.	• Entire Project completed by September 30, 2013, which is almost 15 months prior to Department's "no later than" completion date of December 19, 2014. • Committed to use of ABC techniques at all locations, which will reduce the impacts to the public by reducing the number of partial and full closures needed to construct these structures, including the use of SPMT technology at 200 South Lindon, Proctor Lane, Sam White Lane, and 500 East American Fork.		• 200 South Lindon to Center St Provo (including University Parkway), which includes the highest congestion for the Project, is under construction for most of the Project duration (42 months).

USABLE SEGMENTS

Evaluation Criteria – Completion of Segments that improve regional mobility and provide major regional arterial connectivity

Edit	Facts	Edit	Significant Strengths	Minor Strengths	Minor Weaknesses	Significant Weaknesses
	Project in six Segments, north to south: 1. Segment 6: Lehi Main Street to 200 South in Lindon 2. Segment 5: 200 South in Lindon to University Pkwy 3. Segment 4: University Parkway to Provo Center Street 4. Segment 3: Provo Center Street to University Avenue 5. Segment 2: University Avenue to UPRR 6. Segment 1: UPRR to US 6/ Spanish Fork Main Segment start and completion dates (completed for use by public), chronologically by completion dates: 1. Segment 6: 03/10 to 09/30/12 2. Segment 3: 05/11 to 09/30/12 3. Segment 2: 03/11 to 09/30/12 4. Segment 5: 09/10 to 09/30/13 5. Segment 4: 03/10 to 09/30/13 6. Segment 1: 09/10 to 09/30/13 (Note: start dates identified as "early start" in narrative, not identified as commitment dates.) Regional Mobility Narrative [3.3.1.c1] 1. Using two-phased approach to complete construction in all Segments of the corridor. 2. Using ABC techniques to minimize duration of bridge reconstructions. 3. Completing the CFI at University Parkway/Sandhill prior to construction starting in Segments 4 and 5. 4. Keeping key cross-streets open (at least one lane on 1600N, 800N, Center Street Orem, Center Street Provo, and Spanish Fork Main) during construction instead of complete closure, and reconstructing interchange cross-streets while ramps are closed in some cases. 5. Completing Segments 2, 3, and 6 first for the sake of population and businesses at Orem and Provo. 6. Keeping Provo Center Street cross-streets and all ramp fully open during construction for the sake of relief to University Avenue. 7. US6 and Spanish Fork Main interchange. No long term closures of most of the movements at the interchanges, for the sake of not having to reroute traffic with a closure of either of the US6 ramps.		• Three of six segments of the Project delivered within 34 months, including the highest traffic volume area of the Project. By completing I-15 mainline from the UPRR Crossing south of US 77 to Provo Center St, and Lehi Main to 200 S Lindon by September 30, 2012, available one year prior to their Project Completion. • The completion of Segments 6, 3, and 2 by September 30, 2012 in durations of 31.3, 7.2, and 17.2 months respectively (25.8 months early). Segment 6 has the highest traffic volume.	• The completion of the CFI at University Parkway/Sandhill Road prior to construction starting in Segments 4 and 5. • Keeping key cross-streets (1600N, 800N, Center Street Orem, and Center Street Provo) open during construction. • Keeping Provo Center Street fully open during construction. There were zero cross street closures utilized by TTC.	• The full benefits provided to the public by the early completion of Segments 6, 2, and 3 are unlikely to be fully realized due to the later completion of Segments 1, 5 and 4, which interrupts mainline continuity. • The area with the highest congestion is within Segments 4 and 5, which are not delivered until September 30, 2013.	

MEDIUM - TTC

SCHEDULE COMPATIBILITY

Evaluation Criteria - Compatibility of the schedule with contractual and proposal elements, such as:

o Right of way schedule
o Permits
o Maximum Payment Curve
o High Risk Utility relocations
o Third Party Agreements

Edit	Facts	Edit	Significant Strengths	Minor Strengths	Minor Weaknesses	Significant Weaknesses
	• Contract Compatibility NTP1: 01/14/10 NTP2: 03/05/10 Segment 6 Complete: 09/28/12 Segment 2 Complete: 09/28/12 Segment 3 Complete: 09/28/12 Segment 1 Complete: 09/30/13 Segment 5 Complete: 09/30/13 Segment 4 Complete: 09/30/13 Project Completion: 10/30/13 Final Acceptance: 01/28/14			• Schedule comments: - High level of detail. Schedule has a level of conservatism in which possible time could be made up. - Schedule appears consistent with all contractual requirements and with proposal. Well organized, thorough, clearly communicated. Durations appear conservative, with overall high level of confidence that contract and proposal aspects are captured and advanced.	• Compatibility with contractual and proposal elements (Utilities, ROW, Third Party, etc.) - Consistently schedule irrigation relocation during the irrigation season - Utility Work design time for RMP, Qwest, and Questar is less than what has been agreed upon by the Owner and as required by the Contract Documents. - Schedule shows multiple construction activities (utility relocations) starting prior to NTP2, Contract does not allow.	

LOW

PROJECT MANAGEMENT COSTS

Evaluation Criteria – Department project management cost savings as a result of a shorter Project completion schedule

Edit	Facts	Edit	Significant Strengths	Minor Strengths	Minor Weaknesses	Significant Weaknesses
	13.6 months of Department project management cost savings. "One year of UDOT project management cost savings resulting from TTC accelerated schedule"			Close to one year ahead of 12/2014.		